

REMARKS

Claims 8, 9, 19, 20, 25 and 29-38 are pending in the application. The Examiner has rejected to Claims 8, 9, 19, 20, 25 and 29-36 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being incomplete. The Examiner also has rejected to Claims 8, 9, 19, 20, 25 and 29-36 under 35 U.S.C. §101, as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner has rejected to Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Citation #4 ("Text Proposal Regarding TFCI Coding For FDD", TSGR1#7(99)D69, August 30 - September 3, 1999). The Examiner has rejected to Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Citation #4. The Examiner has rejected to Claim 9 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Citation #4 in view of Claydon et al. (U.S. Patent 5,742,622). The Examiner has rejected to Claims 25, 29-31, 33, 34, 36 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Citation #4 in view of Citation #7 ("Harmonization Impact On TFCI And New Optimal Coding For Extended TFCI With Almost No Complexity Increase", TSGR#6(99)970, July 13-16, 1999), and further in view of Claydon et al.

The Examiner rejected Claims 8, 9, 19, 20, 25 and 29-36 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being incomplete, and bases this rejection on M.P.E.P §2172.01. The Examiner also rejected Claims 8, 9, 19, 20, 25 and 29-36 under 35 U.S.C. §101, as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 8, 19, 25 and 29 have been amended as set forth herein to more clearly recite the interrelation between the elements. Based on at least the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 8, 9, 19, 20, 25 and 29-36 under 35 U.S.C. §112 and §101 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected independent Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Citation #4 ("Text Proposal Regarding TFCI Coding For FDD", TSGR1#7(99)D69, August 30 - September 3, 1999). Claim 19 of the present application relates to (48,10) coding. The references, Citation #4 and Citation #7, relate to (32,10) coding for improving (32,6) or (16,5) TFCI coding. Block coding is defined by a unique sequence, puncturing pattern, etc. in accordance with a coding length. That is, when a coding length is

changed, a completely different code is required by a channel that requires changing the entire coding structure. Accordingly, Claim 19 of the present application, which describes a new sequence and puncturing pattern for (48,10) coding, is distinguished from the references. Claim 19 has been amended to specifically recite (48,10) encoding as set forth herein. Based on at least the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected independent Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Citation #4. The Examiner stated that the specific mask sequences and puncturing patterns would be obvious to one skilled in the art. It was believed that the specific mask sequences and puncturing patterns recited in the claims of the present application are not obvious. It was further believed that the claims of the present application relate to (48,10) coding. The references, Citation #4 and Citation #7, relate to (32,10) coding for improving (32,6) or (16,5) TFCI coding. Block coding is defined by a unique sequence, puncturing pattern and so on in accordance with a coding length. As stated above, when a coding length is changed, a completely different code has to be designed by a channel, thus changing the entire coding structure. Accordingly, Claim 8 of the present application, which describes a new sequence and puncturing pattern for (48,10) coding, is distinguished from the references. Claim 8 has been amended herein to specifically recite (48,10) coding. Based on at least the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected independent Claims 25 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Citation #4 in view of Citation #7 ("Harmonization Impact On TFCI And New Optimal Coding For Extended TFCI With Almost No Complexity Increase", TSGR#6(99)970, July 13-16, 1999), and further in view of Claydon et al. It is the position of the Examiner that the specific mask sequences and puncturing patterns recited in Claims 25 and 29 would be obvious to one skilled in the art. It was previously submitted that the specific mask sequences and puncturing patterns recited in the claims of the present application are not obvious. It was also submitted that the claims of the present application relate to (48,10) coding. The (48,10) coding scheme of Claims 25 and 29 uses a (64,10) code, 16 bits of the 64 bit code

being punctured to result in the 48 bit code. The puncturing positions are specifically set forth in Claims 25 and 29 as {0, 4, 8, 13, 16, 20, 27, 31, 34, 38, 41, 44, 50, 54, 57, 61}. These specific mask sequences and puncturing pattern are not disclosed by the references. Based on at least the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections of independent Claims 25 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 8, 19, 25 and 29 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 9, 20 and 30-38, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective amended independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 9, 20 and 30-38 is respectfully requested. Furthermore, new dependent Claims 32-38 are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons given above with respect to the independent claims from which they depend.

Accordingly, after entry of this Response, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 8, 9, 19, 20, 25 and 29-38, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicants

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516

PJF/MJM/dr